



Wilcox, C. R., Calvert, A., Metz, J., Kilich, E., MacLeod, R., Beadon, K., Heath, P. T., Khalil, A., Finn, A., Snape, M. D., Vandrevalla, T., Nadarzynski, T., Coleman, M. A., & Jones, C. E. (2019). Attitudes of Pregnant Women and Healthcare Professionals Toward Clinical Trials and Routine Implementation of Antenatal Vaccination Against Respiratory Syncytial Virus: A Multicenter Questionnaire Study. *Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal*, 38(9), 944-951.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/INF.0000000000002384>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1097/INF.0000000000002384](https://doi.org/10.1097/INF.0000000000002384)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins at <https://insights.ovid.com/crossref?an=00006454-201909000-00015> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

**Attitudes of pregnant women and healthcare professionals
towards clinical trials and routine implementation of
antenatal vaccination against respiratory syncytial virus: a
multi-centre questionnaire study**

Christopher R Wilcox MBBCh ¹, Anna Calvert MRCPh ², Jane Metz MBBS ³, Eliz Kilich
BM BCh ², Rachael MacLeod MBChB ³, Kirsten Beadon BSc ⁴, Paul T Heath MRCPh ²,
Asma Khalil MD ^{5,6}, Adam Finn PhD ³, Matthew D Snape MD ⁴, Tushna Vandrevalla
PhD ⁷, Tom Nadarzynski PhD ^{8,9}, Matthew A Coleman MD ¹⁰, Christine E Jones PhD ¹¹

1: NIHR Clinical Research Facility, University Hospital Southampton NHS
Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK

2: Vaccine Institute, St George's, University of London, London, UK

3: Bristol Children's Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

4: Oxford Vaccine Group, Department of Paediatrics, University of Oxford and the
NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, Oxford, UK

5: Fetal Medicine Unit, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, St George's
University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

6: Vascular Biology Research Centre, Molecular and Clinical Sciences Research
Institute, St George's, University of London, London, UK

7: School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Faculty of Business & Social
Sciences, Kingston University, Kingston, London, UK

8: Department of Psychology, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

9: Department of Psychology, University of Westminster, London, UK

10: Department of Fetal Medicine, Princess Anne Hospital, University Hospital
Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK

11: Faculty of Medicine and Institute for Life Sciences, University of
Southampton and University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust,
Southampton, UK

Abbreviated title

Attitudes to antenatal RSV vaccination: a questionnaire study

Running title

Attitudes to antenatal RSV vaccination

49 **Corresponding author**

- 50 - Dr Christopher Wilcox
51 - NIHR Clinical Research Facility, Southampton Centre for Biomedical
52 Research, C Level West Wing, Mailpoint 218, Southampton General Hospital,
53 Tremona Road, Southampton, SO16 6DY
54 - Email: christopher.wilcox@soton.ac.uk
55 - Telephone: 02381204956
56 - Fax: 02381205023

57
58 **Keywords:** Vaccination; Pregnancy; Respiratory Syncytial Virus; RSV; Clinical
59 Trials; Attitudes
60

61 **Conflict of Interests Statement**

62 CW, AC, JM, KB, PH, AK, AF, MS and CJ are investigators for clinical trials done on
63 behalf of their respective institutions, sponsored by various vaccine
64 manufacturers, but receive no personal funding for these activities.
65
66

Abstract

Introduction

Respiratory Syncytial Virus (RSV) is a common cause of infant hospitalisation and mortality. With multiple vaccines in development, we aimed to determine [1] the awareness of RSV amongst pregnant women and healthcare professionals (HCPs), and [2] attitudes towards clinical trials and routine implementation of antenatal RSV vaccination.

Methods

Separate questionnaires for pregnant women and HCPs were distributed within four hospitals in South England (July 2017-January 2018).

Results

Responses from 314 pregnant women and 204 HCPs (18% obstetricians, 75% midwives, 7% unknown) were analyzed. Most pregnant women (88%) and midwives (66%) had no/very little awareness of RSV, unlike obstetricians (14%). Amongst pregnant women, 29% and 75% would likely accept RSV vaccination as part of a trial, or if routinely-recommended, respectively. Younger women (16-24 years), those of 21-30 weeks' gestation, and with experience of RSV were significantly more likely to participate in trials (OR: 1.42 [1.72-9.86]; OR: 2.29 [1.22-4.31]; OR: 9.07 [1.62-50.86], respectively). White-British women and those of 21-30 weeks' gestation were more likely to accept routinely-recommended vaccination (OR: 2.16 [1.07-4.13]; OR: 2.10 [1.07-4.13]). Obstetricians were more likely than midwives to support clinical trials (92% vs. 68%, OR: 2.50, 1.01-6.16) and routine RSV vaccination (89% vs. 79%, OR: 4.08, 1.53-9.81), as were those with prior knowledge of RSV, and who deemed it serious.

Conclusion

RSV awareness is low amongst pregnant women and midwives. Education will be required to support successful implementation of routine antenatal

99 vaccination. Research is needed to understand reasons for vaccine hesitancy
100 amongst pregnant women and HCPs, particularly midwives.
101
102

Introduction

Respiratory Syncytial Virus (RSV) is the leading viral cause of lower respiratory tract infection and bronchiolitis in infants, and is a major cause of hospitalization and mortality worldwide ¹. RSV infects more than 60% of children in their first year of life, and almost 100% by two years of age ². The estimated case fatality ratio for children hospitalized with severe RSV disease is 0.3% in industrialized countries, and 2.1% in developing countries³. Severe illness often occurs in children under six months ⁴, particularly in those born prematurely or with underlying chronic illness, and the development of novel prevention and treatment strategies is an international priority ^{5 6}.

Antenatal vaccination is an effective means of protecting young infants from infection when the period of greatest susceptibility is shortly after birth ⁷⁻¹⁰, and is now routinely recommended for use against a number of pathogens, including tetanus, influenza and pertussis ¹¹. No vaccine against RSV is yet approved for routine use, however a number of candidates are in development ^{12 13}, one of which is undergoing international phase III efficacy trials in pregnant women (NCT02624947) ^{11 14}. An advantage of vaccination in pregnancy, rather than infancy, is that protection is afforded to infants from birth and extends through the period of highest risk of severe disease.

Achieving vaccine acceptance amongst pregnant women and maternity healthcare professionals (HCPs) has proven to be a considerable public health

challenge, particularly in developed countries, and uptake of routine vaccination (especially influenza) remains suboptimal¹⁵. Furthermore, recruitment of pregnant women into clinical trials may be difficult, particularly as historically they have been excluded from participation, and there is a paucity of information regarding their recruitment and retention^{16 17}. Pre-emptively ascertaining the level of awareness of RSV amongst pregnant women and HCPs, as well as their attitudes to vaccine clinical trials and routine implementation of an RSV vaccine, may allow us to identify interventions to optimise both recruitment for future trials and uptake in a routine setting.

Our aims were to determine [1] the level of awareness of RSV amongst pregnant women and HCPs, and [2] their attitudes towards clinical trials and routine implementation of RSV antenatal vaccination.

Methods

Questionnaire design and development

Two separate anonymized questionnaires were developed for pregnant women and maternity HCPs (see supplementary information). These were developed with input from a multi-disciplinary study team including pediatricians, obstetricians, and health psychologists. Pregnant women and maternity HCPs were asked about their awareness and experience of RSV and bronchiolitis, pregnant women were asked whether they would hypothetically consider receiving an RSV vaccine as part of a clinical trial or if a vaccine were routinely recommended, and maternity HCPs if they would support clinical trials and routine recommendations. Women were also asked about the number of vaccines they would deem acceptable during pregnancy, and their opinions regarding the design of vaccine clinical trials. Part way through the questionnaire (having completed a self-assessment of their prior awareness/experience of RSV and bronchiolitis), participants were provided with written information on RSV and bronchiolitis inside a sealed envelope. This was done in order to inform further questions, whilst avoiding biasing their self-assessment in the previous section. Ethical approval was granted (reference 17/LO/0537) and the study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov prior to recruitment (NCT03096574).

Study population and recruitment

175 The questionnaire for pregnant women was administered to women (aged ≥ 16
176 years at the time of recruitment) attending for routine antenatal care at four
177 study sites in southern England: University Hospital Southampton NHS
178 Foundation Trust, Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, University
179 Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, and St George's University Hospitals
180 NHS Foundation Trust, London. These four study sites were selected due to their
181 high birth rates (all >4000 births/year¹⁸), and by distributing our questionnaire
182 across four hospitals we attempted to increase the demographic diversity of our
183 study population. The HCP questionnaire was administered to those working in
184 either midwifery or obstetrics at the same four sites. Antenatal care for low-risk
185 women in the UK is midwife-led, with women only seeing an obstetrician if they
186 have a high-risk pregnancy, therefore the majority of potential respondents to
187 our questionnaire were midwives.

188

189 Recruitment of participants took place from July 2017 to January 2018. Pregnant
190 women were recruited in-person at antenatal clinics and wards by members of
191 the study team on an opportunistic (non-sequential) basis over the recruitment
192 period, and given paper questionnaires to complete. For recruitment of HCPs, all
193 obstetricians and midwives at the participating institutions were identified by a
194 senior member of staff not involved in the study (using email distribution lists).
195 They were then contacted via an email containing a link to an online
196 questionnaire, followed by two email reminders. Alternatively, HCPs may also
197 have been recruited in-person by the study team (in a similar fashion to
198 pregnant women), in which case they were also given paper questionnaires. At
199 the time of recruitment, information provided on the nature of the questionnaire

was kept to a minimum in order to avoid biasing participant responses. The participant information sheet stated only that the aim of the study was to better understand their attitudes towards RSV and vaccination during pregnancy. Participation in the study was voluntary and no financial or other incentive was offered. All participants gave informed consent.

Questionnaire data analysis

Questionnaire data were entered at the lead site (Southampton) into iSurvey (www.isurvey.soton.ac.uk). Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25. Ordinal regression analysis was performed, and adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated. P-values <0.05 were considered as statistically significant. Multicollinearity was examined using the tolerance test and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) to ensure variables with a VIF value exceeding 2.5 were not entered into the multivariate regression analysis.

Results

A total of 525 participants completed the questionnaires: 321 pregnant women and 204 HCPs (18% obstetricians, 75% midwives, and for 7% the professional role was unknown). Seven questionnaires from pregnant women, and five from HCPs, were excluded due to largely incomplete or illegible responses, leaving 513 (98%) for analysis. The numbers of respondents were equally distributed between the four study sites. The full characteristics of respondents are displayed in Table 1.

Responses from pregnant women

Most pregnant women reported no (71%) or very little (17%) awareness of RSV, and reported no experience (93%) [see Figure 1]. They were much more familiar with the term 'bronchiolitis' (only 14% had never heard of it), and bronchiolitis tended to be perceived as more common and serious than RSV.

Of 312 who responded, 28% were likely/very likely, 32% not sure, and 40% unlikely/very unlikely to consider receiving RSV vaccination as part of a clinical trial. The most important information to women was the likelihood of side effects for their baby (see Figure 2). Ordinal regression analysis (see Table 2) demonstrated that women were significantly more likely to accept RSV vaccination as part of a clinical trial if they had direct experience of RSV (OR: 9.07, 95% CI: 1.62-50.86), were of younger age (16-24 years, OR: 1.42, 95% CI: 1.72-9.86) and of 21-30 weeks' gestation (OR: 2.29, 95% CI: 1.22-4.31). Women

were significantly less likely to consider taking part if they perceived
bronchiolitis as extremely/moderately serious (OR: 0.38, 95% CI: 0.15-0.93) or
somewhat serious (OR: 0.27, 95% CI: 0.11-0.68).

More women would accept the vaccine if it was routinely recommended: of 308
who responded, 40% were very likely, 35% likely, 16% not sure, 5% unlikely
and 4% very unlikely. Women were significantly more likely to accept routine
RSV vaccination if they identified as White British (OR: 2.16, 95% CI: 1.22-3.83)
versus non-White British, and were of 21-30 weeks' gestation (OR: 2.10, 95% CI:
1.07-4.13)

The most popular method of being approached regarding study involvement was
face-to-face by their midwife (37%), but 26% wouldn't have a preference (see
Figure 3). The amount of time pregnant women would need to consider whether
or not to participate in a trial was variable, but 72% responded \leq one week (17%
<24 hours, 22% 1-2 days, 33% 3-7 days, 18% 2-3 weeks, and 10% >1 month).
For the majority (82%), their decision to participate wouldn't be altered if the
study was a randomised controlled trial, but 15% would be less likely to take
part, and 3% would be more likely. For 66%, their decision wouldn't be altered if
the study involved different doses of vaccine, but 31% would be less likely to
take part, and 3% would be more likely. The number of vaccines in pregnancy
deemed acceptable by women was variable, however 25% would accept two
vaccines or less, 27% would accept three, 11% four, 6% five, and 32% would
accept more than five (i.e. as many as were recommended). Finally, in the free-
text comments (see supplementary information), some women raised concerns

regarding side-effects for their baby, and others stated support for vaccination, often describing personal experience.

Responses from maternity healthcare professionals

HCPs had greater awareness and experience of RSV than pregnant women, however obstetricians were significantly more familiar than midwives with both RSV (OR: 9.42, 95% CI: 5.08-25.30, $p < 0.0001$) and bronchiolitis (OR 2.68, 95% CI: 1.29-5.55, $p = 0.008$) [see Figure 1].

Of 192 HCPs who responded, 72% were likely/very likely, 19% not sure, and 9% unlikely/very unlikely to support a clinical trial of RSV vaccination. The most important information to HCPs was the likelihood of side effects for the baby. Ordinal regression analysis (see Table 2) demonstrated that HCPs were significantly more likely to consider supporting a clinical trial if they were obstetricians (OR: 2.50, 95% CI: 1.01-6.16), had good/some understanding of RSV (OR: 4.42, 95% CI: 1.10-17.83), and perceived RSV as extremely (OR: 4.85, 95% CI: 1.11-21.28) or moderately/somewhat serious (OR: 4.16, 95% CI: 1.26-13.75). Likelihood of support also varied between study sites, with HCPs from sites A, B and C being significantly more likely to support a trial than those in site D.

More HCPs would support administration of the vaccine if it was routinely recommended: 47% definitely, 34% likely, 14% not sure, 4% unlikely and 0.5% very unlikely. Obstetricians were significantly more likely than midwives to support the administration of a routine RSV vaccine (OR: 4.08, 95% CI: 1.53-

9.81), as were those HCPs with good/some understanding of RSV (OR: 6.07, 95% CI: 1.23-29.93) and those who perceived RSV as moderately/somewhat serious (OR: 4.41, 95% CI: 1.32-14.78) [see Table 3]. Likelihood of supporting a routine RSV vaccine also varied significantly by study site with HCPs from sites A, B being significantly more likely to support routine vaccination than those in site D. Finally, in the free-text comments [see supplementary information] some HCPs reported concerns regarding the possibility of side-effects for the baby.

Discussion

The high burden of RSV infection has driven recent efforts to develop an effective antenatal vaccine. This is a large multi-centre study in which we have attempted to establish the level of awareness of RSV, and attitudes to vaccine clinical trials and routine implementation of an RSV vaccine during pregnancy.

The awareness of RSV was low amongst pregnant women and midwives, compared with obstetricians. Younger pregnant women, those of 21-30 weeks' gestation, and those recalling direct experience of RSV, were significantly more likely to consider involvement in an RSV vaccine trial; and direct face-to-face interaction with a midwife was the preferred method of potential recruitment (amongst those who had a preference). Encouragingly, the majority of women would accept routine RSV vaccination, yet some (25%) would still be unsure or unlikely to accept vaccination, particularly those of ethnic minorities, and one-quarter would accept ≤ 2 vaccines during pregnancy. Approximately 70% and 80% of HCPs would be likely to support an RSV vaccine trial and routine RSV vaccination respectively. Obstetricians were more likely than midwives to support both RSV trials and routine vaccination, as were those with prior knowledge of RSV and those who perceived it as a serious cause of infection. Support for potential RSV trials and routine vaccination also varied significantly by study site.

It is notable that the awareness of RSV is so low given that RSV-associated respiratory tract infection is one of the commonest causes of infant hospitalisation and mortality worldwide ¹. Being thoroughly informed as to the indication and efficacy of vaccination has been shown to significantly increase the probability of its acceptance^{19 20}. Therefore, with a number of RSV vaccine candidates currently in development, further education of both pregnant women and HCPs will be needed if we are to optimise engagement with vaccination trials and eventual uptake of RSV vaccines as part of routine care. Both pregnant women and HCPs seemed to better identify with the term bronchiolitis than RSV, and therefore specifically highlighting the link between these may be helpful in educational strategies. We do note that those who perceived bronchiolitis as serious were significantly less likely to consider participating in an RSV trial, however it is possible that this is a result of confounding due to a lack of knowledge regarding bronchiolitis. It is also interesting to note that women of 21-30 weeks' gestation were significantly more accepting of both RSV trials and routine vaccination, perhaps due to a sense of reassurance following their 20-week anomaly scan and subsequent clinical review. Finally, the finding that women of ethnic minorities were less likely to accept routine RSV vaccination has been similarly observed in a number of previous studies of routinely-recommended vaccines²¹⁻²³, yet the underlying reasons remain poorly understood, and may include cultural/religious differences, as well as language barriers.

It is concerning that a number of the HCPs surveyed in this study would be unlikely to support either clinical trials or routine vaccination against RSV.

Maternity HCPs can be strong advocates for antenatal vaccination, and encouragement from them (particularly midwives) may increase intention by up to 20 times²⁴²⁵. Furthermore, HCPs are well-placed to facilitate clinical trial recruitment by identifying and speaking directly to eligible women, and addressing specific concerns about research safety and practicality¹⁷. It is important to note that obstetricians were significantly more willing to provide support for both clinical trials and routine vaccination than midwives, independent of their prior knowledge/experience of RSV or bronchiolitis. Barriers to engagement of midwives and nurses in research that have been identified in previous studies, include high workload, insufficient staff numbers and resources, a lack of confidence, and a lack of a research-supportive culture ²⁶ ²⁷. Finally, the observed differences in support for both routine vaccination and clinical trials between study sites also suggests that there may be a potential risk of health inequalities based on differing recommendations across the South of England. All four sites had been involved in trials of antenatal vaccination (including RSV trials) prior to this study, and all have recently embedded vaccination into their routine antenatal care service. Site D only recently set up this vaccination service however (following the completion of this study), whereas it has been operating at the other sites for a longer period of time. They also report having comparatively less involvement from clinical teams in their vaccination trials. This may therefore, at least in part, explain the lower acceptance at this institution compared with sites A, B and C.

Implications for clinical practice and research

It is clear that education about RSV and bronchiolitis for pregnant women will be required in order to optimise uptake rates of antenatal RSV vaccination if it is introduced into routine care. Such education should highlight the safety and benefits of vaccination for their child, as studies have consistently shown that perception of potential harm to the baby is the primary reason for vaccine refusal ^{25 28}, whereas messages emphasising the protective benefits conferred to infants is a major motivator for pregnant women to undergo vaccination ²⁹. As well as face-to-face counselling, possible strategies could include paper and online education resources ^{40 30}, as well as mobile phone text messages (such as Text4baby ³¹) and smart phone apps (such as MatImms ³²). Education for HCPs on RSV and bronchiolitis will also be required in order to ensure active promotion of vaccination, and individual institutions should aim to tackle any general vaccine hesitancy within their own working body.

With regards to improving uptake into future antenatal vaccine trials, it is important to note that the majority of our respondents wouldn't be deterred by a randomized controlled trial design, and that direct face-to-face interaction with an HCP was the preferred method of recruitment. Improving study team outreach and forming integrated networks between research teams and healthcare providers/clinical staff may help improve clinicians' willingness to promote clinical studies to their patients, as well as pregnant women's willingness to join studies ¹⁷, and this has proven a successful method of recruiting pregnant women in previous studies ^{33 34}. Social media and web-based recruitment may be used as a cost-effective supplement to traditional recruitment methods, and facilitate participation of traditionally harder-to-reach

populations ^{17 35}, however this approach may be less successful for higher-risk intervention-based studies, including antenatal vaccine trials.

Finally, it should be noted that there are other potential antenatal vaccines in development (including group B streptococcus and cytomegalovirus ¹¹), for which education and support from staff will also be required for successful implementation ²² . Furthermore, it is also worth considering that whilst a third of our respondents would accept as many vaccines as were recommended, many women may be reluctant to accept high numbers of vaccines, especially if given on separate occasions^{36 37}. Pragmatic research is therefore required to consider the logistical aspects of future antenatal vaccine delivery.

Strengths and limitations

This study had significant numbers of respondents, and by distributing our questionnaire across four hospitals in southern England we attempted to maximise the diversity of our study population. That said, the responses to the questionnaire cannot be taken as representative of all pregnant women and maternity HCPs. Our respondents were all recruited from antenatal clinics based in tertiary hospitals, and therefore it is also possible that our sample was missing subsets of the population that tend to be more anti-vaccination. Future studies might benefit from recruiting over a wider geographical area, and from different types of sites (such as non-tertiary hospitals and primary care), and perhaps utilising online recruitment via pregnancy-associated websites and social media. It may have been also beneficial to collect socio-economic data from our participants in order to assess the representativeness of our study sample. Other

limitations are that data on the uptake of antenatal vaccination was not collected from women's medical records following delivery, and data on the uptake of influenza vaccination amongst HCPs wasn't collected. Finally, the number of pregnant women/HCPs approached, and the number who declined participation (as well as their reasons for doing so) was not recorded, and we are therefore unable to report this data.

Conclusions

RSV awareness appears low amongst pregnant women and midwives in the UK. Education will be required to optimise engagement with vaccination trials and eventual uptake of RSV vaccination following routine implementation, with an emphasis on women of ethnic minorities. Active promotion of vaccination must be incorporated into routine antenatal care, and further research is needed to understand reasons for vaccine hesitancy amongst both pregnant women and HCPs, particularly midwives.

Figure captions [images to be reproduced in colour online only]:

Figure 1: Reported familiarity and experience with RSV (A & B) and bronchiolitis (C) amongst pregnant women, midwives and obstetricians, prior to their involvement in this study.

Figure 2: Information that would be considered most important to the pregnant women in this study when deciding whether to take part in a research study of an RSV vaccine (A), and other factors which would discourage them from taking part (B).

Figure 3: Preferred method of being approached regarding potential clinical trial involvement amongst the pregnant women in this study

Acknowledgements

The authors would also like to thank all the pregnant women and healthcare staff who took part in the questionnaire, Stephen Yekini for his assistance with data collection in Southampton, and all of the non-study staff that helped facilitate recruitment in the participating sites.

Author Contributions

CW drafted the manuscript and was principal investigator. All authors contributed to questionnaire design and critically revised the manuscript. CW, AC, JM, EK, RM, KB, PH, AK, AF, MS, TV, TN, MC and CJ were involved in study set up and data collection at the participating sites. CW, TN and CJ performed the data analysis. CJ conceived the study and was chief investigator. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interests Statement

CW, AC, JM, KB, PH, AK, AF, MS and CJ are investigators for clinical trials done on behalf of their respective institutions, sponsored by various vaccine manufacturers, but receive no personal funding for these activities.

Funding

The study was supported by a grant from the British Paediatric Allergy Immunity and Infection Group (BPAIIG). BPAIIG had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis/interpretation, report writing, or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Clinical trial registration

The questionnaire study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov prior to recruitment (NCT03096574).

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was granted from the West London & GTAC NHS Research Ethics Committee (reference 17/LO/0537).

References

1. Hall CB, Weinberg GA, Iwanae MK, Blumkin AK, Edwards KM, et al. The Burden of Respiratory Syncytial Virus Infection in Young Children. *New Engl J Med* **360**, 588–598 (2009).
2. Resch, B. Burden of respiratory syncytial virus infection in young children. *World J Clin Pediatr* **1**, 8–12 (2012).
3. Nair H, Nokes DJ, Gessner BD, Dherani M, Madhi SA, Singleton RJ. Global burden of acute lower respiratory infections due to respiratory syncytial virus in young children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* **375**, 1545–55 (2010).
4. Nokes DJ, Ngama M, Bett A, Abwao J, Munywoki P, English M, et al. Incidence and Severity of Respiratory Syncytial Virus Pneumonia in Rural Kenyan Children Identified through Hospital Surveillance. *Clin Infect Dis* **49**, 1341–1349 (2009).
5. Yamin D, Jones FK, DeVincenzo JP, Gertler S, Kobiler, Townsend JP, et al. Vaccination strategies against respiratory syncytial virus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. **113**, 13239–13244 (2016).
6. Saso, A. & Kampmann, B. Vaccination against respiratory syncytial virus in pregnancy: a suitable tool to combat global infant morbidity and mortality? *Lancet Infect Dis* **16**, e153–e163 (2016).
7. Poehling KA, Szilagyi PG, Staat MA, et al. Impact of maternal immunization on influenza hospitalizations in infants. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2011;204(6 Suppl 1):S141–8.
8. Amirthalingam G, Andrews N, Campbell H, et al. Effectiveness of maternal pertussis vaccination in England: an observational study. *Lancet*. 2014;384(9953):1521–1528.
9. Zaman K, Roy E, Arifeen SE, et al. Effectiveness of maternal influenza immunization in mothers and infants. *New Engl J Med*. 2008;359(15):1555–64.
10. Madhi SA, Cutland CL, Kuwanda L, et al. Influenza Vaccination of Pregnant Women and Protection of Their Infants. *New Engl J Med*. 2014;371(10):918–931.
11. Jones CE, Calvert A, Le Doare K. Vaccination in Pregnancy – Recent Developments. *The Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal* (2018). doi:10.1097/INF.0000000000001822
12. Munoz FM, Piedra PA, Glezen WP. Safety and immunogenicity of respiratory syncytial virus purified fusion protein-2 vaccine in pregnant women. *Vaccine* **21**, 3465–7 (2003).
13. Chu HY, Steinhoff MC, Magaret A, Zaman K, Roy E, Langdon G, et al. Respiratory Syncytial Virus Transplacental Antibody Transfer and Kinetics in Mother-Infant Pairs in Bangladesh. *J Infect Dis* **210**, 1582–1589 (2014).
14. Kaaijk P, Luytjes W, Rots N. Vaccination against RSV: is maternal vaccination a good alternative to other approaches? *Hum Vaccin immunother* **9**, 1263–7 (2013).
15. Bisset K, Paterson P. Strategies for increasing uptake of vaccination in pregnancy in high-income countries: A systematic review. *Vaccine* (2018). doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.04.013
16. Blehar MC, Spong C, Grady C, Goldkind SF, Sahin L, Clayton JA. Enrolling pregnant women: issues in clinical research. *Womens Health Issues* **23**, e39–45 (2013).

- 545 17. Frew PM, Saint-Victor DS, Brewinski Isaacs M, Kim S, Swamy GK, Sheffield
546 JS. Recruitment and retention of pregnant women into clinical research trials: an
547 overview of challenges, facilitators, and best practices. *Clin Infect Dis*. **59 Suppl 7**,
548 S400–7 (2014).
- 549 18. NHS Digital. NHS Maternity Statistics, England 2016-2017. (2018).
- 550 19. Donaldson B, Jain P, Holder BS, Lindsey B, Regan L, Kampmann B. What
551 determines uptake of pertussis vaccine in pregnancy? A cross sectional survey in
552 an ethnically diverse population of pregnant women in London. *Vaccine* **33**,
553 5822–5828 (2015).
- 554 20. Panda B, Stiller R, Panda, A. Influenza vaccination during pregnancy and
555 factors for lacking compliance with current CDC guidelines. *J Matern Fetal*
556 *Neonatal Med* **24**, 402–406 (2011).
- 557 21. Goldfarb IT, Little S, Brown J, Riley LE. Use of the combined tetanus-
558 diphtheria and pertussis vaccine during pregnancy. *A J Obstet Gynecol* **211**,
559 299.e1–299.e5 (2014).
- 560 22. McQuaid F, Jones C, Steven Z, Meddaugh G, O'Sullivan C, Donaldson B, et
561 al. Antenatal vaccination against Group B streptococcus: Attitudes of pregnant
562 women and healthcare professionals in the UK to participation in clinical trials
563 and routine implementation. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand* **97**, 330-340(2018).
- 564 23. Dempsey A, Brewer S, Seveck C, et al. Tdap vaccine attitudes and
565 utilization among pregnant women from a high-risk population. *Hum Vaccin*
566 *Immunother* **12**, 872–878 (2016).
- 567 24. Wiley KE, Massey PD, Cooper SC, Wood NJ, Ho J, et al. Uptake of influenza
568 vaccine by pregnant women: a cross-sectional survey. *Med J Aust* **198**, 373–375
569 (2013).
- 570 25. Wiley KE, Massey PD, Cooper SC, Wood NJ, Quinn HE, Leask J. Pregnant
571 women's intention to take up a post-partum pertussis vaccine, and their
572 willingness to take up the vaccine while pregnant: A cross sectional survey.
573 *Vaccine* **31**, 3972–3978 (2013).
- 574 26. Mitchell K, Baillie L, Phillips N. Increasing nurse and midwife engagement
575 in research activity. *Nursing Standard* **29**, 37–42 (2015).
- 576 27. Purkis J, Jackson JA, Hundt G, Stockman C. Increasing nursing research
577 capacity in the workplace. *Nurs Times* **104**, 28–31 (2008).
- 578 28. Sim J, Ulanika A, Katikireddi S, Gorman D. 'Out of two bad choices, I took
579 the slightly better one': Vaccination dilemmas for Scottish and Polish migrant
580 women during the H1N1 influenza pandemic. *Public Health* **125**, 505–511
581 (2011).
- 582 29. Marsh H, Malik F, Shapiro E, Omer S, Frew P. Message Framing Strategies
583 to Increase Influenza Immunization Uptake Among Pregnant African American
584 Women. *Matern Child Health J* **18**, 1639–1647 (2014).
- 585 30. Zhou L, Zhang D, Yang C, Wang Y. Harnessing social media for health
586 information management. *Electron Commer R A* **27**, (2018).
- 587 31. Gazmararian JA, Elon L, Yang B, Graham M, Parker R. Text4baby program:
588 an opportunity to reach underserved pregnant and postpartum women? *Matern*
589 *Child Health J* **18**, 223–32 (2014).
- 590 32. Holder B, Borgeau M, Donaldson B, Davies J, Kampmann B. MatImms: A
591 smartphone app to inform and educate women about maternal immunisation.
592 Poster presentation at 4th International Neonatal and Maternal Immunisation
593 Symposium, Brussels, Belgium, 10-12/09/2017

33. Coleman-Phox K, Laraia BA, Adler N, Vieten C, Thomas M, Epel E. Recruitment and retention of pregnant women for a behavioral intervention: lessons from the maternal adiposity, metabolism, and stress (MAMAS) study. *Prev Chronic Dis* **10**, (2013).
34. Kerver JM, Elliot MR, Norman GS, Sokol RJ, Keating DP, Copeland GE, et al. Pregnancy recruitment for population research: the National Children's Study vanguard experience in Wayne County, Michigan. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* **27**, 303–11 (2013).
35. Shere M, Zhao AY, Koren G. The role of social media in recruiting for clinical trials in pregnancy. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e92744 (2014).
36. Webb H, Street J, Marshall H. Incorporating immunizations into routine obstetric care to facilitate Health Care Practitioners in implementing maternal immunization recommendations. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* **10**, 1114–21 (2014).
37. Krishnaswamy S, Wallace E, Buttery J, Giles M. Strategies to implement maternal vaccination: A comparison between standing orders for midwife delivery, a hospital based maternal immunisation service and primary care. *Vaccine* **36**, 1796–1800 (2018).

Table 1: Characteristics of the questionnaire respondents (pregnant women and maternity healthcare professionals)

Characteristic	Pregnant women, n=314	Healthcare professionals, n=199
Age		
16-24	34 (11%)	
25-30	107 (34%)	
31-35	92 (29%)	
36-40	58 (19%)	
41+	13 (4%)	
Gestation (weeks)		
<12	8 (2%)	
12-16	37 (12%)	
17-20	31 (10%)	
21-30	55 (18%)	
31-36	93 (30%)	
>37	76 (24%)	
Study site		
A	88 (28%)	43 (22%)
B	77 (25%)	53 (27%)
C	79 (25%)	61 (31%)
D	70 (22%)	42 (21%)
Ethnicity		
Asian (British, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese, other)	25 (8%)	4 (2%)
Black (British, African, Caribbean, other)	17 (5%)	4 (2%)
White (British, Irish, other)	248 (79%)	175 (88%)
Mixed (Caribbean, African, Asian, other)	11 (4%)	6 (3%)
Other ethnic group (Arab, other)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)
Did not want to say	1 (0.3%)	1 (1%)
No response	10 (3%)	9 (5%)
Has children		
No	142 (45%)	72 (36%)
Yes	172 (55%)	127 (64%)
Profession		
Obstetrics		37 (19%)
Midwifery		151 (76%)
No response		11 (6%)
Midwifery seniority		
Band 5 (newly-qualified midwife)		8 (5%)
Band 6 (junior midwife)		84 (56%)
Band 7 (senior midwife)		46 (30%)
Band 8 (midwifery manager)		8 (5%)
No response		5 (3%)
Obstetrician seniority		
Specialty training years 1-3 (or equivalent)		8 (22%)
Specialty training years 4-6 (or equivalent)		6 (16%)
Specialty training years 7-8 (or equivalent)		6 (16%)
Consultant		17 (46%)
Time spent working in maternity care (years)		
<2		17 (9%)
2-5		29 (15%)
6-10		37 (19%)
11-15		20 (10%)
16-20		26 (13%)
>21		62 (31%)
No response		8 (4%)

624 **Table 2:** Ordinal regression analysis of factors predicting pregnant women's willingness to
625 consider undergoing RSV vaccination during pregnancy as part of a clinical trial, or if routinely
626 recommended

<i>Variable</i>	Number who'd be 'extremely likely' or 'likely' to accept RSV vaccination as part of a clinical trial	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)	Number who'd be 'extremely likely' or 'likely' to accept RSV vaccination if routinely recommended	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)
<i>Age in years</i>				
16-24	18/34 (53%)	1.42 (1.72-9.86) **	27/34 (79%)	0.68 (0.28-1.67)
25-35	54/199 (27%)	1.18 (0.67-2.07)	149/198 (75%)	0.71 (0.39-1.28)
36-45	16/70 (23%)	1.00 for reference	53/70 (76%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Gestation in weeks</i>				
<12	3/8 (38%)	1.99 (0.46-8.51)	6/8 (75%)	0.67 (0.15-3.00)
12-20	24/68 (35%)	1.26 (0.72-2.22)	52/68 (76%)	1.17 (0.65-2.10)
21-30	18/55 (33%)	2.29 (1.22-4.31) **	42/54 (78%)	2.10 (1.07-4.13) *
31+	43/168 (26%)	1.00 for reference	128/168 (76%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Study site</i>				
Site A	25/86 (29%)	0.80 (0.40-1.59)	65/87 (75%)	0.99 (0.49-2.00)
Site B	23/77 (30%)	0.72 (0.35-1.49)	62/76 (82%)	1.26 (0.59-2.69)
Site C	20/79 (25%)	0.54 (0.26-1.10)	55/76 (72%)	0.78 (0.37-1.63)
Site D	20/70 (29%)	1.00 for reference	50/69 (72%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Previous children</i>				
Yes	50/171 (29%)	1.13 (0.71-1.81)	122/171 (71%)	0.64 (0.39-1.05)
No	39/141 (28%)	1.00 for reference	110/137 (80%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Ethnicity</i>				
White British	66/224 (29%)	1.27 (0.73-2.21)	177/223 (79%)	2.16 (1.22-3.83) **
Non-White British	23/88 (26%)	1.00 for reference	55/85 (65%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Previous RSV experience</i>				
Direct experience	5/8 (63%)	9.07 (1.62-50.86) *	8/8 (100%)	8.20 (0.71-94.16)
Indirect experience	5/13 (38%)	1.11 (0.32-3.81)	10/13 (77%)	1.09 (0.30-3.96)
No experience	79/291 (27%)	1.00 for reference	214/287 (75%)	1.00 for reference
<i>RSV familiarity</i>				
Good/some understanding	5/14 (36%)	0.54 (0.12-2.30)	11/14 (79%)	1.77 (0.37-8.56)
Poor understanding	21/77 (27%)	0.80 (0.47-1.38)	55/76 (72%)	0.96 (0.55-1.68)
No understanding	63/219 (29%)	1.00 for reference	164/216 (76%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Perceived RSV frequency</i>				
Extremely/moderately common	18/50 (36%)	1.12 (0.53-2.35)	39/51 (76%)	1.03 (0.47-2.23)
Somewhat common	34/99 (34%)	1.52 (0.88-2.61)	75/98 (77%)	0.93 (0.53-1.64)
Slightly/not at all common	37/143 (26%)	1.00 for reference	107/141 (76%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Perceived RSV severity</i>				
Extremely/moderately serious	43/129 (33%)	1.22 (0.58-2.57)	100/129 (78%)	1.31 (0.60-2.86)
Somewhat serious	33/117 (28%)	0.93 (0.47-1.84)	87/115 (76%)	1.06 (0.52-2.18)
Slightly/not at all serious	13/43 (30%)	1.00 for reference	33/43 (77%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Bronchiolitis familiarity and experience</i>				
Good/moderate understanding and direct/indirect experience	27/88 (31%)	1.30 (0.65-2.60)	68/89 (76%)	0.75 (0.36-1.53)
Slight understanding	29/102 (28%)	1.13 (0.63-2.00)	77/101 (76%)	0.81 (0.44-1.48)
No understanding	32/120 (27%)	1.00 for reference	86/116 (74%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Perceived bronchiolitis frequency</i>				
Extremely/moderately common	33/107 (31%)	0.67 (0.33-1.37)	85/107 (79%)	1.04 (0.49-2.19)
Somewhat common	26/96 (27%)	1.25 (0.68-2.31)	69/95 (73%)	1.36 (0.72-2.60)
Slightly/not at all common	26/101 (26%)	1.00 for reference	73/98 (74%)	1.00 for reference
<i>Perceived bronchiolitis severity</i>				
Extremely/moderately serious	55/190 (29%)	0.38 (0.15-0.93) *	143/188 (76%)	0.63 (0.24-1.65)
Somewhat serious	19/84 (23%)	0.27 (0.11-0.68) *	62/84 (74%)	0.52 (0.20-1.36)
Slightly/not at all serious	11/28 (39%)	1.00 for reference	20/26 (77%)	1.00 for reference

*=p<0.05; **=p<0.01

630 **Table 3:** Ordinal regression analysis of factors predicting the willingness of healthcare
631 professionals to support RSV vaccination during pregnancy as part of a clinical trial, or if
632 routinely recommended
633

<i>Variable</i>	Number who'd be 'very likely' or 'likely' to support RSV vaccination as part of a clinical trial	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)	Number who'd be 'very likely' or 'likely' to support RSV vaccination if routinely recommended	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)
Professional group				
Obstetrics	34/37 (92%)	2.50 (1.01-6.16) *	33/37 (89%)	4.08 (1.53-9.81) **
Midwifery	102/151 (68%)	1.00 for reference	119/151 (79%)	1.00 for reference
Time in maternity care				
21+ years	46/62 (74%)	0.51 (0.14-1.83)	46/62 (74%)	0.43 (0.12-1.62)
11-20 years	31/46 (67%)	0.38 (0.11-1.34)	34/46 (74%)	0.79 (0.22-2.86)
2-10 years	47/66 (71%)	0.68 (0.22-2.10)	60/66 (91%)	1.39 (0.43-4.42)
<2 years	14/17 (82%)	1.00 for reference	15/17 (88%)	1.00 for reference
Study site				
Site A	30/41 (73%)	3.94 (1.46-10.61) **	34/41 (83%)	3.95 (1.39-11.26) *
Site B	35/53 (66%)	3.19 (1.23-8.30) *	46/53 (87%)	6.23 (2.22-17.46) ***
Site C	51/61 (84%)	5.80 (2.36-14.21) ***	47/61 (77%)	1.97 (0.81-4.83)
Site D	22/37 (59%)	1.00 for reference	29/37 (78%)	1.00 for reference
Has own children				
Yes	88/127 (69%)	0.59 (0.28-1.24)	101/127 (80%)	0.86 (0.39-1.91)
No	50/65 (77%)	1.00 for reference	55/65 (85%)	1.00 for reference
Ethnicity				
White British	126/175 (72%)	1.01 (0.34-3.06)	142/175 (81%)	1.41 (0.44-4.46)
Non-White British	12/17 (71%)	1.00 for reference	14/17 (82%)	1.00 for reference
RSV experience				
Direct experience	22/26 (85%)	2.65 (0.79-8.86)	24/26 (92%)	1.41 (0.39-5.07)
Indirect experience	20/27 (74%)	1.17 (0.42-3.31)	23/27 (85%)	0.74 (0.25-2.22)
No experience	96/139 (69%)	1.00 for reference	109/139 (78%)	1.00 for reference
RSV familiarity				
Good/some understanding	19/22 (86%)	4.42 (1.10-17.83) *	20/22 (91%)	6.07 (1.23-29.93) *
Poor understanding	87/114 (76%)	1.81 (0.88-3.73)	91/114 (80%)	1.07 (0.51-2.24)
No understanding	32/55 (58%)	1.00 for reference	44/55 (80%)	1.00 for reference
Perceived RSV frequency				
Extremely common	29/36 (81%)	1.43 (0.45-4.51)	30/36 (83%)	1.96 (0.57-6.76)
Moderately/somewhat common	84/116 (72%)	0.92 (0.43-1.98)	95/116 (82%)	1.20 (0.54-2.67)
Slightly/not at all common	25/39 (64%)	1.00 for reference	30/39 (77%)	1.00 for reference
Perceived RSV severity				
Extremely serious	27/35 (77%)	4.85 (1.11-21.28) *	26/35 (74%)	1.25 (0.28-5.55)
Moderately/somewhat serious	113/138 (82%)	4.16 (1.26-13.75) *	117/138 (85%)	4.41 (1.32-14.78) *
Slightly/not at all serious	8/17 (47%)	1.00 for reference	12/17 (71%)	1.00 for reference
Bronchiolitis familiarity and experience				
Good/moderate understanding and indirect/direct experience	58/77 (75%)	0.84 (0.10-6.94)	66/77 (86%)	0.99 (0.12-8.35)
Slight understanding	78/111 (70%)	0.98 (0.13-7.49)	87/111 (78%)	0.98 (0.13-7.56)
No understanding	2/4 (50%)	1.00 for reference	3/4 (75%)	1.00 for reference
Perceived bronchiolitis frequency				
Extremely common	29/34 (85%)	1.05 (0.34-3.25)	27/34 (79%)	0.55 (0.17-1.80)
Moderately/somewhat common	88/124 (71%)	1.44 (0.63-3.29)	104/124 (84%)	1.07 (0.45-2.51)
Slightly/not at all common	21/34 (62%)	1.00 for reference	25/34 (74%)	1.00 for reference
Perceived bronchiolitis severity				
Extremely serious	36/47 (77%)	0.35 (0.054-2.28)	38/47 (81%)	0.96 (0.15-6.39)
Moderately/somewhat serious	96/136 (71%)	0.29 (0.052-1.65)	111/136 (82%)	0.54 (0.10-2.99)
Slightly/not at all serious	6/9 (67%)	1.00 for reference	7/9 (78%)	1.00 for reference

634
635 *=p<0.05; **=p<0.01; ***=p<0.001
636

Supplementary information

1) Questions for pregnant women analysed in this study

(1) Before taking part in this survey, how familiar were you with Respiratory Syncytial Virus (sometimes shortened to RSV)?

- ☐ I have never heard of it
- ☐ I have heard of it, but don't really know what it is
- ☐ I know some facts about what it is
- ☐ I have a good understanding about RSV infection and its implications

(2) What experience do you have of RSV?

- ☐ I have no experience of it
- ☐ I know someone who has experience of it
- ☐ I have direct experience of it

(3) How common do you think RSV infection is in babies and young children?

- ☐ Not at all common
- ☐ Slightly common
- ☐ Somewhat common
- ☐ Moderately common
- ☐ Extremely common

(4) How serious do you think RSV infection is for babies and young children?

- ☐ Not at all serious
- ☐ Slightly serious
- ☐ Somewhat serious
- ☐ Moderately serious
- ☐ Extremely serious

(5) Before taking part in this survey, how familiar were you with bronchiolitis in babies and young children?

- ☐ I have never heard of it
- ☐ I have heard of it but don't know what it is
- ☐ I know some facts about it
- ☐ I know what it is and know someone who has experience of it
- ☐ I know what it is and have direct experience of it

(6) How common do you think bronchiolitis is in babies and young children?

- ☐ Not at all common
- ☐ Slightly common
- ☐ Somewhat common
- ☐ Moderately common
- ☐ Extremely common

(7) How serious do you think bronchiolitis is for babies and young children?

- ☐ Not at all serious
- ☐ Slightly serious
- ☐ Somewhat serious
- ☐ Moderately serious
- ☐ Extremely serious

(8) Would you be *potentially* willing to receive a RSV vaccine during pregnancy as part of a research study to determine its safety and effectiveness, before the vaccine is approved for routine use?

Your response to this question will not affect whether or not you receive further information about such studies and does not mean that you are agreeing to take part in any vaccine research studies.

- ☐ Extremely unlikely
- ☐ Unlikely
- ☐ Neutral/not sure
- ☐ Likely
- ☐ Extremely likely

(9) What information would you consider to be important when considering taking part in a research study of a RSV vaccine?

Please rank the top 3 most important to you: (1= most important information for you to know)

- ☐ How common RSV is
- ☐ How serious RSV is
- ☐ Number of healthy adults who have received the vaccine
- ☐ Number of pregnant women who have received the vaccine
- ☐ Likelihood of side effects for me
- ☐ Likelihood of side effects for my baby

(10) One type of a research study is a “Randomised Controlled Trial” where there are two (or more) groups who are treated exactly the same, except only one group gets the true vaccine under investigation. The other group may get a ‘placebo’ (dummy or inactive) injection.

This type of study allows the researchers to check that any differences between the groups are due to the vaccine only. Importantly, patients or staff do not get to choose whether they receive the proper vaccine or the dummy.

After reading the above information:

- ☐ I would be less likely to take part as I would want to guarantee that I would have the vaccine
- ☐ I would be more likely to take part as I might not get the vaccine
- ☐ This would not affect my decision

(11) In some randomised controlled trials, patients are given different doses (amounts) of the vaccine under investigation in order to work out which is the best dose to use in future vaccines. These different doses would be calculated before the trial starts, but patients or staff involved in the study do not get to choose which of these doses they receive.

After reading the above information:

- ☐ I would be less likely to take part
- ☐ I would be more likely to take part
- ☐ This would not affect my decision

(12) What other factors would discourage you from taking part in a research study of a vaccine in pregnancy?

Please rank the following: (1= factor that would most discourage you, 4= factor least likely to discourage you)

- ☐ Number of hospital visits
- ☐ Number of home visits
- ☐ Number of blood tests for me
- ☐ Number of blood tests for baby

747 ☐ Other, please
748 specify.....
749 ...

750

751 **(13) How would you most like to be approached about taking part in a research study?**

752 **Tick one answer:**

- 753 ☐ Asked by my midwife
754 ☐ Asked by my obstetrician
755 ☐ Asked by my GP
756 ☐ Given a leaflet/poster with contact details for the study team
757 ☐ Adverts of the internet (e.g. pregnancy forums)
758 ☐ Email from the study team
759 ☐ Approached directly by the study midwife/doctor
760 ☐ I wouldn't mind how I was approached
761 ☐

762 Other:.....
763

764

765 **(14) If you were approached about taking part in a research study, how much time would you**
766 **like to fully consider whether or not you would like to take part?**

- 767 ☐ <24 hours
768 ☐ 1-2 days
769 ☐ 3-7 days
770 ☐ 2-3 weeks
771 ☐ >1 month

772

773 **(15) Would you be willing to receive this vaccine in pregnancy if it was routinely recommended**
774 **for use in pregnancy in the NHS?**

- 775 ☐ Definitely
776 ☐ Probably
777 ☐ Maybe
778 ☐ Probably not
779 ☐ Definitely not

780

781 **(16) There are a number of different vaccines that are being designed for use in pregnancy to**
782 **protect mothers and infants against severe infection. How many vaccines would be acceptable to**
783 **you in pregnancy?**

- 784 ☐ 0
785 ☐ 1
786 ☐ 2
787 ☐ 3
788 ☐ 4
789 ☐ 5
790 ☐ More than 5

791

792 **(27) How old are you in years?**

793 16-24 ☐ 25-30 ☐ 31-35 ☐ 36-40 ☐ 41-45 ☐ 46+ ☐

794

795 **(28) How many weeks pregnant are you?**

796 Less than 12 ☐ 12-16 ☐ 17-20 ☐ 21-30 ☐ 31-36 ☐ 37+ ☐

797

798 **(19) To what ethnic group do you feel you belong? (Please circle)**

799

800 **White** **Black / African / Caribbean / Black**

801 **British**

802 - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish - African

- 803 / British Irish - Caribbean
 804 - Gypsy or Irish Traveller - Other (please
 805 specify).....
 806 - Other (please specify)
 807
 808 **Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups** **Other ethnic group**
 809 - White and Black Caribbean - Arab
 810 - White and Black African - Other (please
 811 specify).....
 812 - White and Asian
 813 - Other (please specify)
 814
 815 **Asian / Asian British** **I'd prefer not to say**
 816 - Indian
 817 - Pakistani
 818 - Bangladeshi
 819 - Chinese
 820 - Other (please specify)
 821

822 **(20) Have you had any children before?**

823 ☐ Yes.

824 If yes, how many?.....

825 What are their ages?

826 Child 1: Less than 1 ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-16 ☐ 17+ ☐

827 Child 2: Less than 1 ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-16 ☐ 17+ ☐

828 Child 3: Less than 1 ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-16 ☐ 17+ ☐

829 ☐ No

830
 831 **(21) Optional: Do you have any comments or concerns about any of the issues raised in the**
 832 **questionnaire?**
 833
 834

835 **2) Questions for healthcare professionals analysed in this study**

836
 837 **(1) Before taking part in this survey, how familiar were you with Respiratory Syncytial Virus**
 838 **(sometimes shortened to RSV)?**

839 ☐ I have never heard of it

840 ☐ I have heard of it, but don't really know what it is

841 ☐ I know some facts about what it is

842 ☐ I have a good understanding about RSV infection and its implications
 843

844 **(2) What experience do you have of RSV?**

845 ☐ I have no experience of it

846 ☐ I know someone who has experience of it

847 ☐ I have direct experience of it
 848

849 **(3) How common do you think RSV infection is in young children?**

850 ☐ Not at all common

851 ☐ Slightly common

852 ☐ Somewhat common

853 ☐ Moderately common

854 ☐ Extremely common
 855

856 **(4) How serious do you think RSV infection is for young children?**

857 ☐ Not at all serious

858 ☐ Slightly serious

- 859 ☐ Somewhat serious
 860 ☐ Moderately serious
 861 ☐ Extremely serious
 862
 863 **(5) Before taking part in this survey, how familiar were you with bronchiolitis in young children?**
 864 ☐ I have never heard of it
 865 ☐ I have heard of it but don't know what it is
 866 ☐ I know some facts about it
 867 ☐ I know what it is and know someone who has experience of it
 868 ☐ I know what it is and have direct experience of it
 869
 870 **(6) How common do you think bronchiolitis is in young children?**
 871 ☐ Not at all common
 872 ☐ Slightly common
 873 ☐ Somewhat common
 874 ☐ Moderately common
 875 ☐ Extremely common
 876
 877 **(7) How serious do you think bronchiolitis is for young children?**
 878 ☐ Not at all serious
 879 ☐ Slightly serious
 880 ☐ Somewhat serious
 881 ☐ Moderately serious
 882 ☐ Extremely serious
 883
 884 **(8) Would you be *potentially willing* to support a randomised controlled trial of RSV vaccine in pregnancy to determine its safety and how well it prevents infection in children, by signposting the study to women?**
 885
 886
 887 *Your response to this question will not affect whether or not you receive further information about such studies*
 888
 889
 890 ☐ Extremely unlikely
 891 ☐ Unlikely
 892 ☐ Neutral/not sure
 893 ☐ Likely
 894 ☐ Extremely likely
 895
 896 **(9) Would you be willing to support the administration of this vaccine if it was routinely recommended for use in the NHS?**
 897
 898 ☐ Definitely
 899 ☐ Probably
 900 ☐ Maybe
 901 ☐ Probably not
 902 ☐ Definitely not
 903
 904 **(10) What factors would influence your decision regarding whether or not you would be willing to support involvement in a RSV vaccine research study before it is licensed?**
 905
 906
 907 **Please rank the top 3 factors: (1= factor that would most influence you)**
 908
 909 ☐ The number of pregnant women who had previously received the vaccine in research studies
 910 ☐ How common RSV is in children
 911 ☐ Seriousness of RSV infection in young children
 912 ☐ How effective the vaccine is in preventing *RSV infection*
 913 ☐ How effective the vaccine is in preventing *severe RSV disease*
 914 ☐ Risk of side effects for the mother

915 ☐ Risk of side effects for developing baby
916 ☐ Other (please specify):
917
918
919 **(11) How many pregnant women would the vaccine have to be safely tested on in a research**
920 **study for you to consider supporting such a trial?**
921 ☐ None
922 ☐ Over 10
923 ☐ Over 100
924 ☐ Over 500
925 ☐ Over 1000
926 ☐ Over 5000
927 ☐ Over 10,000
928 ☐ I would not support such a trial
929
930 **(12) Which healthcare professional group do you belong to?**
931 ☐ Obstetrics
932 ☐ Midwifery
933 ☐ Other (please state)
934
935
936 **(13) How long have you worked in maternity care?**
937 ☐ Under 2 years
938 ☐ 2-5 years
939 ☐ 6-10 years
940 ☐ 11-15 years
941 ☐ 16-20 years
942 ☐ 21+ years
943
944 **(14) What is your grade?**
945 *1. Midwifery/nursing staff*
946 Band 4 ☐ Band 5 ☐ Band 6 ☐ Band 7 ☐ Band 8 ☐ Band 9 ☐
947 *2. Obstetricians*
948 ST 1-3 (or equivalent) ☐ ST 4-6 (or equivalent) ☐ ST 7-8 (or equivalent) ☐ Consultant
949 ☐
950
951 **(15) Have you had any children before?**
952 ☐ Yes.
953 If yes, how many?.....
954 What are their ages?
955 Child 1: Less than 1 ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-16 ☐ 17+ ☐
956 Child 2: Less than 1 ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-16 ☐ 17+ ☐
957 Child 3: Less than 1 ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-16 ☐ 17+ ☐
958 Child 4: Less than 1 ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-16 ☐ 17+ ☐
959 ☐ No
960
961 **(16) To what ethnic group do you feel you belong? (Please circle)**
962
963 **White** **Black / African / Caribbean / Black**
964 **British**
965 - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish - African
966 / British Irish - Caribbean
967 - Gypsy or Irish Traveller - Other (please
968 specify).....
969 - Other (please specify)
970
971 **Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups** **Other ethnic group**

- 972 - White and Black Caribbean - Arab
 973 - White and Black African - Other (please
 974 specify).....
 975 - White and Asian
 976 - Other (please specify)

- 977
 978 **Asian / Asian British** **I'd prefer not to say**
 979 - Indian
 980 - Pakistani
 981 - Bangladeshi
 982 - Chinese
 983 - Other (please specify)

984
 985 **(17) Optional: Do you have any comments or concerns about vaccination or vaccine research**
 986 **studies during pregnancy?**

987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994

995 **3) Free-text comments from pregnant women and healthcare professionals**

996
 997 *Response to the question: Do you have any **comments** or **concerns** about vaccination or vaccine*
 998 *research studies during pregnancy?*
 999

1000 **Pregnant women**

- 1001
 1002 1. I think vaccine trials are very risky even though very important so every available information
 1003 should be made available to the participant before commencing including all known possible
 1004 side effects
 1005
 1006 2. Many vaccines contain unsafe levels of mercury in some cases some are produced on human
 1007 tissue (DNA) and contain various other toxins. I believe a baby is born with a perfect immune
 1008 system which takes up to 3 years to fully develop and that it's not healthy injecting a
 1009 perfectly healthy child with chemicals and toxins (mercury)
 1010
 1011 3. I am glad to hear that the NICE guidelines will be reviewed and that possibly new vaccines
 1012 will be introduced
 1013
 1014 4. I am taking part in a RSV vaccine trial
 1015
 1016 5. I'm very keen for my baby to have as many vaccines as possible & fully support such research
 1017
 1018 6. I would want the vaccine fully tested and approved before I would have it
 1019
 1020 7. Our daughter suffered from bronchiolitis at age 2 weeks old so as long as the vaccine was
 1021 safe we would definitely have it to prevent this baby suffering like our daughter did
 1022
 1023 8. I would consider vaccination if I was having a normal singleton pregnancy
 1024
 1025 9. I'm a bit of a unique case because I've had an adverse reaction to a vaccine in the past and
 1026 wouldn't risk it in pregnancy unless I had to

10. Child died at 20 months. RSV sounds very like what my son had when he died
11. No concerns. I am very pro vaccinations both for myself during pregnancy and for my children
12. I am having a slightly bumpy pregnancy and this is one of the reasons I would be reluctant to take part in a research study which could increase the risks for the pregnancy complications. If I was a low-risk person I would be more willing to take part. Likewise, if this wasn't my first baby I might be more willing
13. Information about the potential side effects of the trial vaccinations would have been helpful for me to make more informed decisions
14. I've not heard of RSV before sounds concerning and something I would have liked to have been told about earlier in my pregnancy
15. I've heard of many children developing chest infections as young babies and anything to avoid this I feel should be actively encouraged
16. I would like the opportunity to ask more questions and have more information before agreeing to vaccination
17. I would only have medication in pregnancy that has been approved by the BMA. Diabetics have a lot of complications anyway
18. No - thank you for all the amazing work/research you do
19. I believe the stage of drug trial to be more pertinent to the decision-making process than the number of vaccinations received.
20. My concern in taking part in a research study is the unknown side effects to my baby and whether the potential side effects would cause more harm than the virus itself. Whilst I appreciate research needs to be done and the vaccine will have been thoroughly tested on other test groups testing pregnant women/babies is still a concern for me
21. Not really aware enough of the issue to comment on some of the questions
22. In my experience, the flu vaccine has made me ill. I would not feel comfortable having a trial vaccine as a first-time mother

Maternity healthcare professionals

1. I would want to see safety data in non-pregnant participants concerning side effects and efficacy before I supported vaccine studies on pregnant women. I understand that effectiveness in preventing baby bronchiolitis could not be assessed using non-pregnant subjects but would reassure health workers that we aren't supporting an action that could cause harm.
2. I would worry about safety /side effects to mum and baby if not tested before being given to pregnant women
3. Knowledge to midwives about RSV is very limited without having first-hand experience of it or working alongside paediatric teams. It's not widely taught in training perhaps because our care for infants doesn't go much beyond 10-28 days postnatally
4. My son needed ECMO because of this infection but he was too unstable to transfer to Gt O S we very nearly lost him at 12 days old. He caught it from his sister who was 2 and poorly

1085 when he was born. This serious infection wiped the first 2 months of a normal newborn
1086 period for us. He did get asthma as a child and took months to catch up.
1087
1088 5. Side effects - baby especially.
1089
1090 6. I'm not convinced that RS virus needs vaccination. Depends on the severity of chance of later
1091 disease in the child. I think we build up immunity ourselves and therefore the number
1092 needed to treat is probably high to prevent severe RS virus infection in children.
1093
1094 7. I would want some evidence that the vaccine is safe.
1095
1096 8. My children were born at 27/40 and 32/40 week's gestation. For our 27/40 week-old baby it
1097 was very serious.
1098
1099 9. Potential risks to unborn and ability to be honest with mother about risks v benefits.
1100
1101 10. Risk to unborn.
1102
1103 11. Can't really answer question of how many women vaccines would have to be safely tested
1104 on as I don't know what the predicted rate of adverse reactions/side effects. As long as
1105 sufficiently powered I would be happy. No concerns as long as properly conducted.
1106 Vaccination research environment is heavily regulated so very confident.
1107
1108 12. That the vaccine is safe for the mother and unborn child. This has to be paramount and is of
1109 high concern with the majority of the public.
1110
1111 13. When testing for side effects -there should be follow-up of at least 5 years on the child
1112 whose mother received the vaccine. We are woefully short on long-term effects and in order
1113 to fully discuss (and understand) the effects of vaccinations in pregnancy these time-frames
1114 should be mandatory. Lack of long-term data does not reassure me that we should be
1115 vaccinating in pregnancy.
1116
1117 14. Effect on the baby that are so far unknown. Another vaccine could it be combined with
1118 present vaccines?
1119
1120 15. I would worry about a trial re the long term unknown effects on the health of children whose
1121 mothers received the vaccine whilst they were in utero.
1122
1123 16. Yes, the potential risks to mother and unborn baby
1124